

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
SAN FRANCISCO DIVISION

IN RE: UBER TECHNOLOGIES, INC.,
PASSENGER SEXUAL ASSAULT
LITIGATION

Case No. 3:23-md-03084-CRB

**[PROPOSED] ORDER REGARDING
MOTION TO DISMISS DUPLICATIVE
CASES**

This Document Relates to:

E.B. v. Uber Technologies, Inc., et al.,
No. 3:24-cv-09052-CRB

A.P. v. Uber Technologies, Inc., et al.,
No. 3:25-cv-02105-CRB

T.B. 1475 v. Uber Technologies, Inc., et al., No. 3:25-cv-02989-CRB

Jane Roe CL 146 v. Uber Technologies, Inc., et al., No. 3:25-cv-03719-CRB

E.B. v. Uber Technologies, Inc., et al.,
No. 3:25-cv-04526-CRB

Arpitkumar Patel v. Uber Technologies, Inc., et al., No. 3:25-cv-05287-CRB

Jane Doe LS 618 v. Uber Technologies, Inc., et al., No. 3:25-cv-06160-CRB

K.L. v. Uber Technologies, Inc., et al.,
No. 3:25-cv-06178-CRB

[PROPOSED] ORDER

Having considered Defendants' Motion to Dismiss Duplicative Cases, the Court finds that the Plaintiffs subject to Defendants' Motion have filed two separate but substantively identical complaints in this multidistrict litigation. The later-filed of each of Plaintiffs' two complaints will be dismissed with prejudice to protect the parties' rights and in the interest of judicial economy.

The Court therefore hereby ORDERS that the following cases are DISMISSED WITH PREJUDICE:

1. *E.B. v. Uber Technologies, Inc. et al.*, No. 3:25-cv-04526-CRB
2. *Jane Roe CL 146 v. Uber Technologies, Inc. et al.*, No. 3:25-cv-03719-CRB
3. *K.L. v. Uber Technologies, Inc. et al.*, No. 3:25-cv-06178-CRB
4. *Patel v. Uber Technologies, Inc. et al.*, No. 3:25-cv-05287-CRB

Additionally, the Plaintiffs in these four cases are ORDERED TO SHOW CAUSE why they should not be required to pay Defendants' reasonable attorneys' fees and costs of \$16,278 incurred to file Defendants' Motion to Dismiss Duplicative Cases.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Dated: _____, 2025

HON. CHARLES R. BREYER
United States District Court Judge